

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/621,215	07/17/2003	Wanda Ying Li	USP2026A-WYL	1058	
7590 07/06/2004			EXAM	INER	
Raymond Y. C	Chan	SEMBER, THOMAS M			
Suite 128 108 N. Ynez Av	/e	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Monterey, CA 91754			2875		
		DATE MAIL FD: 07/06/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		1 4 11 41						
Office Action Summary		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)					
		10/621,21	5	LI, WANDA YING				
		Examin r		Art Unit				
		Thomas M	Sember	2875	And			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address Period for Reply								
THE - Exterester - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pr ter to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by treply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no eve on. a reply within the statu period will apply and will statute, cause the appl	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) days I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from loation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	17 July 2003.						
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-8 and 18-20 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e: a) accepted accept	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) Notice 3) Infor	ot(s) See of References Cited (PTO-892) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Ser No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D. 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate)-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means", "comprising and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Applicant's abstract uses legal terminology ("comprising" and contains at least one run-on sentence.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the parasol claimed in claim 1 and described as element 23 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to

show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the parasol 23 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant

Application/Control Number: 10/621,215

Page 4

Art Unit: 2875

will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-4 and 9-17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46 of U.S. Patent No.6598990. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because applicant merely uses different claim language to more broadly claim applicant's invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in thisOffice action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language

Claims 1-4 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li. Li discloses an umbrella comprising a supporting frame which comprises: a supporting stem 21; and a parasol frame 10, which is supported by said supporting stem, comprising a plurality of elongated awning ribs 13 radially extended in a pivotally movable manner and a shading awning 1 substantially supported by said awning ribs to define a shadowing area thereunder; and a lighting arrangement comprising a plurality of illumination holders 40 provided along said awning ribs 13 respectively, a power supply system 341 mounted on said supporting frame and a chain illuminating system, which is electrically connected to said power supply system, comprising a plurality of chain lighting units 321 alignedly held by said illumination holders (via grooves 41) along said awning ribs for illuminating said shadowing area.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kuelbs. Lee discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching of a power supply on the supporting frame. Lee discloses an umbrella comprising a supporting frame which comprises: a supporting stem 1; and a parasol frame, which is supported by said supporting stem, comprising a plurality of elongated awning ribs 2 radially extended in a pivotally movable manner and a shading awning substantially supported by said awning ribs to define a shadowing area thereunder; and a lighting arrangement comprising a plurality of illumination holders 21 provided along said awning ribs respectively, a plurality of chain lighting units alignedly held by said illumination holders along said awning ribs for illuminating said shadowing area. As broadly claimed, elongated receiving grooves 21 are provided on a bottom side of the awning ribs.

Kuelbs teaches a power supply positioned on a supporting frame 135 for powering a illuminated umbrella. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the umbrella of Lee to include a power source on the supporting frame as taught by Kuelbs in order to provide a portable and easy to use umbrella assembly.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 5-8 and 18-20 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Morgan discloses an illuminated umbrella which is similar to applicant's invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas M Sember whose telephone number is 571-272-2381. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 A.M- 5.30 p.m. first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 703-305-4939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tollfree).

Application/Control Number: 10/621,215

Art Unit: 2875

Thomas M Sember Primary Examiner Art Unit 2875
